

FILED

OCT 26 2021

CLERK, U.S. DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
BY DEPUTY CLERK

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

Ryan Patrick Walter,
Pro Se Litigant,

2:21 - CV 1985 - KJM AC PS

vs.

No.

Title IV D of the Social Security act,
Federal and State Secretaries, Legislative
Analysts, and United States Legislators
having voted to Enact Title IV
part D of The Social Security Act; Person
Serving as Court Clerk City of Bartlesville,
Oklahoma only identified as "Peggy" or
"Penny"; Washington County in the State of
Oklahoma; State's Attorneys for Oklahoma
Department of Human Services, Child
Support Services, Cindy Pickerill and
(other John Doe from June 6, 2021 phone
call); Kevin Buchanan in his Official
Capacity as District Attorney for
Washington County, Oklahoma; Amanda
Lynn Parsons (AKA Amanda Redding) and
her Bigamous Plurality Partner Charles

David Redding, All Directors of Oklahoma
Department of Health and Human Services
And of Division of Child Support Services
from 2000 to 2021, John and Jane Does 1-50
In their Official and Personal Capacities, The
City of Bartlesville in the State of Oklahoma,
City of Bartlesville Oklahoma Police Officers
who's Names are not known.

Defendant(s).

COMPLAINT

**Request for Injunctive
and Declaratory Relief
with Summary
Judgement on Merit**

_____ /

Introduction

1.This action is for relief from the violations by defendants listed who are joint
and several actors in removing and preventing basic fundamental rights and
liberty interests of the Pro Se Litigant which are guaranteed by the United States
Constitution; ***Washington v. Glucksberg, 521 U.S, 702 (1997)*** concerning
**protections against governmental interference into the parents' fundamental
rights being those rights that are of such character of the principles that form
the foundation of all of our institutions of liberty and justice that to remove
them is to remove that foundation as substantive due process concerning the**

care, custody and control of their children; *Stanley v. Illinois*, 405 U.S. 645 (1972). The Pro Se Litigant is a current Legal Studies Major in the University of California System and CAL-law Pre-Law Scholar, having come to this point following destruction of a 15-year oilfield career under the improper application of IV-d policy also having caused parental alienation, extended periods of homelessness and in an effort to learn to advocate for himself in this case and to bring justice to an imbalanced and corrupt system of family law actors within federal, state and county programs.

2. Title IV part D of the Social Security Act defines the program as in the interests of children as a Significant Government Interest, which on its face deserves Strict Scrutiny of the Court which stare decisis exists in *Washington v. Glucksberg*, *Roe v. Wade*, and others to be described as this petition is perfected. This Government Interest does not outbalance the liberty interests in the Liberty of Contracts, Privacy Rights and substantive due process rights found through the 1st, 3rd, 4th, 5th, 6th, 7th, 9th and 14th amendment due process clauses as substantive and procedural due process breaches which, when brought to compel state programs also violates sovereignty clause of the 10th amendment. The IV D program designates interest for the Federal Government in the individual child and creates a 5th amendment procedural due process violation in shifting

69 **burden of proof, while the state programs would suffer under 14th equal**
70 **protections violations but in state codified law strictly forbids mention by Local**
71 **Child Support Agencies (IV D agencies) from stating interest in any individual but**
72 **in the interest of recovering State money expenditures of welfare, TANF and**
73 **any other social services such as medicare or Soonercare or Medical, from the**
74 **noncustodial parent, and so is duplicit for the LCSA being an entity of the IV d**
75 **Federal Program, becoming federalism.**

76 3. Typically fathers who's wives have opted to "marry the state" leaving the
77 unrepresented fathers to face the awesome power of the federal and state
78 government with no legal aid available other than an ineffectual "Family Law Self
79 Help Desk" which only serves to misdirect, stall and prevent timely petition to the
80 correct venue, while suffering financial ruin under false allegations, improper ex-
81 parte hearings, and Bill of Attainder removing effective ability to travel effectively
82 to build an effective response or motion while burdened by unconstitutional shift
83 of burden of proof defending against the improper judgements ordered, or to
84 seek remedy for such improper actions as has been the case for the Pro Se
85 Litigant standing here.

86 4. Washington County Oklahoma has consistently refused to protect the
87 fundamental rights and privileges of marital contract by refusing to prosecute
88 Bigamy in this case, and has refused to enter the fraud into records of the child
89 support case brought within this case having been provided sufficient evidence of
90 the bigamy and marriage to the Pro Se Litigant by Amanda Parsons while Amanda
91 Parsons formed a bigamous plurality relationship with Charles David Redding who
92 also understood the marriage existed and had not been dissolved with two
93 children affected in these interests which belong within the penumbra of privacy
94 rights within the sanctity of marriage, as in *Griswold v. Connecticut*, 381 U.S. 479
95 (1965).

96 5. It may become necessary to join another claim for \$240,000,000 associated
97 with this case which is standing against San Luis Obispo County in California,
98 however jurisdiction remains unclear at this time and Pro Se Litigant asks for
99 opportunity to amend and perfect should joinder become apparently correct for
100 this venue. The claim is associated through a prior case from a prior marriage by
101 which years of seeking audit for improper actions done in 2007 have produced
102 audit results confirming the improper actions and received by the Pro Se Litigant
103 in July 2021 after years of misdirection and shifting burden between Oklahoma
104 and California entities, the Oklahoma entities being the same in the present

petition and joined in harm to the Pro Se Litigant. The improper actions done in the California LCSA (Local Child Support Agency) directly caused a crippling affect on the Pro Se Litigant as entropic effect leading into the present case for financial instability produced by the improper removal of driver license by Oklahoma for non-payment while payment was made and is recorded with overpayment while either Oklahoma or California agencies had withheld funds that had been paid on time, with discovery in the present petition necessary to produce fact finding results and clarification. This California case involves subornation of perjury by a district attorney for compelling a spouse to testify against their spouse and to commit perjury in the testimony while on record.

6. As IV D Agencies, San Luis Obispo County and Kern County both in California being federal agencies, and both connected by material and subject matter to similar organizations in Oklahoma this is a joined matter of federal question. Kern County is servicing the Oklahoma IV D case for Oklahoma Department of Human Services and Washington County Oklahoma IV D agency—Local Child Support Agency—which was ordered \$0 monthly obligation and \$0 arrears due to the fraud existing in their case, yet Kern County continues to report delinquency as if the order does not exist, having reported delinquency to credit agencies on October 13 2021 of \$420. The current case in San Luis Obispo County was also

124 ordered \$0 in December 2013 yet has continued to accrue arrearages in the same
125 manner, while the Pro Se Litigant had lacked litigious acuity in development of
126 that condition which now allows Pro Se objectively material legal understanding
127 through the years of study having allowed this case to now be understood and
128 brought forth with any reasonable sense of legal presence.

129 **Jurisdiction and Venue:**

130 Plaintiff is a resident of the State of California from 1972-2000, and from 2014-
131 Present; **Original Jurisdiction** exists with this court, as this is a federal question
132 relating to multiple elements of Federal Code Constitutional questions for
133 commerce clause, comity clause, due process both substantive and procedural
134 and equal representation of the law Amendments I, IV, V, VI, VII, XI and XIV to the
135 United States Constitution being Supreme Law of the Land and all State or local
136 laws repugnant to this Constitution being invalid law which must rescind.
137 **Diversity of Citizenship** holds this as the correct venue for individuals both private
138 and in official capacities; oppression in office, subornation of perjury and
139 destruction or falsification of records by defendants listed and the damages
140 exceed \$75,000.00.

141 **Claim:**

142 Remedy is sought for harm absorbed by the Plaintiff, Ryan Patrick Walter,
143 originating in the breach of marital contract resultant of his wife, Amanda Lynn
144 Parsons who, having left the family home in Bartlesville, Oklahoma after 7 years
145 of cohabitating and presenting openly in public as husband and wife and
146 producing two children together while living in Oklahoma, with a notarized
147 affidavit of common law marriage and having health insurance coverage together
148 as a married couple with children. After weeks of absence Amanda and a friend
149 came to the home, walked into the house and attempted to physically remove
150 the two children from the home. Plaintiff called Bartlesville police for assistance.
151 The Bartlesville Police Officers questioned paternity and parental rights, and upon
152 examination of the notarized Common Law Marriage Affidavit the officers erred
153 in citing the notarized date to control when marriage began—this was incorercet
154 as Oklahoma law states cohabitation date—also on the affidavit—as defining the
155 marriage and to births of my children within a marriage with their mother, and
156 full rights as Fourteenth Amendment due process right to marry, establish a home
157 and bring up children ***Meyer v. Nebraska***, . This right was ignored under color of
158 law and my children taken by threat of force with the officers stating that they
159 would “take it all the way” while grasping their guns, when asked what force
160 would be expected from them in removing children from their normal home.

Plaintiff had correctly cited Oklahoma case law as the date on the common law affidavit of that which cohabitation had begun to define common law marriage. *"Where the facts show that the mutual intention of a man and woman was to consummate marriage, and that they cohabitated as man and wife, holding themselves out to the public and to neighbors as such at all times, a common-law marriage is established, and the burden is upon one who attacks such marriage to conclusively disprove the same or show its illegality or invalidity"* (**Thomas v. James 1918 OK 241 171** P. 855 69 Okla. 285 Case Number: 8512 Decided: 04/23/1918 Supreme Court of Oklahoma). The Plaintiffs children were kidnapped under the guise of a police officer maintaining order through the police powers to arrest or to kill the Plaintiff, while the officers acting in that time, place and manner caused the two children to be taken from their normal home and effectively made a custody order based on such error and color of law to overcome through demonstrated power and oppress the parental rights and will of the Plaintiff to maintain his family.

Merit:

As found through *Griswold v Connecticut*, 381 U.S. 479 (1965) "Coming to the merits, we are met with a wide range of questions that implicate the Due Process

179 Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment. Overtones of some arguments *482
180 suggest that *Lochner v. New York*, 198 U. S. 45, should be our guide. But we
181 decline that invitation as we did in *West Coast Hotel Co. v. Parrish*, 300 U. S. 379;
182 *Olsen v. Nebraska*, 313 U. S. 236; *Lincoln Union v. Northwestern Co.*, 335 U. S.
183 525; *Williamson v. Lee Optical Co.*, 348 U. S. 483; *Giboney v. Empire Storage Co.*,
184 336 U. S. 490. We do not sit as a super-legislature to determine the wisdom,
185 need, and propriety of laws that touch economic problems, business affairs, or
186 social conditions. This law, however, operates directly on an intimate relation of
187 husband and wife and their physician's role in one aspect of that relation. 482
188 The association of people is not mentioned in the Constitution nor in the Bill of
189 Rights. The right to educate a child in a school of the parents' choice—whether
190 public or private or parochial—is also not mentioned. Nor is the right to study any
191 particular subject or any foreign language. Yet the First Amendment has been
192 construed to include certain of those rights.
193 By *Pierce v. Society of Sisters*, *supra*, the right to educate one's children as one
194 chooses is made applicable to the States by the force of the First and Fourteenth
195 Amendments. By *Meyer v. Nebraska*, *supra*, the same dignity is given the right to
196 study the German language in a private school. In other words, the State may not,

197 consistently with the spirit of the First Amendment, contract the spectrum of
198 available knowledge. The right of freedom of speech and press includes not only
199 the right to utter or to print, but the right to distribute, the right to receive, the
200 right to read (*Martin v. Struthers*, 319 U. S. 141, 143) and freedom of inquiry,
201 freedom of thought, and freedom to teach (see *Wieman v. Updegraff*, 344 U. S.
202 183, 195)—indeed the freedom of the entire university community. *Sweezy v.*
203 *New Hampshire*, 354 U. S. 234, 249-250, 261-263; *Barenblatt v. United States*, 360
204 U. S. 109, 112; *Baggett v. Bullitt*, 377 U. S. 360, 369. Without *483 those
205 peripheral rights the specific rights would be less secure. And so we reaffirm the
206 principle of the *Pierce* and the *Meyer* cases. 483 In *NAACP v. Alabama*, 357 U. S.
207 449, 462, we protected the "freedom to associate and privacy in one's
208 associations," noting that freedom of association was a peripheral First
209 Amendment right. Disclosure of membership lists of a constitutionally valid
210 association, we held, was invalid "as entailing the likelihood of a substantial
211 restraint upon the exercise by petitioner's members of their right to freedom of
212 association." *Ibid.* In other words, the First Amendment has a penumbra where
213 privacy is protected from governmental intrusion. In like context, we have
214 protected forms of "association" that are not political in the customary sense but

pertain to the social, legal, and economic benefit of the members. NAACP v. Button, 371 U. S. 415, 430-431. In Schware v. Board of Bar Examiners, 353 U. S. 232, we held it not permissible to bar a lawyer from practice, because he had once been a member of the Communist Party. The man's "association with that Party" was not shown to be "anything more than a political faith in a political party" (id., at 244) and was not action of a kind proving bad moral character. Id., at 245-246" **GRISWOLD ET AL. v. CONNECTICUT.**

Common Law Marriage is as valid as any marriage in Oklahoma, **Witney v. Witney** 1942 OK 268. A common law marriage does not relieve any party from obligations of marital contract as any other marriage with equal contractual marital duties, including divorcing and dissolving property, custody and support by court order; a liberty to have justice. Amanda Parsons and Plaintiff had an agreement to 50/50 custody without one designated custodial parent in the interest of stability while reconciliation was the goal of Plaintiff as he understood his wife to only want a break, and then was served summons for child support actions and his wife having brought a knowing bigamous partner into the marital interests and affairs and relationship of the parent and child becoming confused. The Washington County District Attorney, Bartlesville Oklahoma Police, Bartlesville Municipal Court Clerk, and Oklahoma Department of Health and Human Services were

234 contacted by the Plaintiff who sought justice on every level and was refused
235 justice, and **by refusing to enter the fact of the existing marriage and felony**
236 **fraud of bigamy into record becomes omission of forms from the file, 21 OS §21-**
237 **531. Destruction, Concealment of records while at the same time Title 18 USC**
238 **241 Conspiracy to Deprivation of Rights, Title 18 USC 242 Violation of Rights**
239 **under Color of Law** is breached with the Plaintiff's rights violated in Fourteenth
240 Amendment due process and equal protection of the law being together with 6th
241 Amendment removed while joining harm of bringing inequitable administrative
242 court action against the Plaintiff with Unclean Hands Doctrine entered by Amanda
243 Parsons per se of bigamy, directly causing and continuing the court action brought
244 under Title IV part D of the Social Security Act, as child support enforcement while
245 the children were illegally removed from the home of the Plaintiff, and with
246 financially crippling affect of child support enforcement actions brought against
247 the plaintiff resultant of the fraudulent conditions directly being the condition of
248 the equity sought through child support being a priori inequitable—unclean hands
249 of the bigamous mother having combined security of a putative marriage while
250 divorce and proper dissolution of property and child custody was denied the
251 Plaintiff without financial means to secure legal council. This has resulted in
252 continuous and expansive harm to the litigant who has been caused to spend

253 years of his life in pursuit of education in Legal Studies in order to begin to
254 formulate petition rather than in the pursuit of liberty interests normally provided
255 in the pursuit of happiness in raising his family under the abridgement of liberties
256 and civil rights violations as shared violation of Oklahoma Law, in miscarriage
257 **Title IV, D** child support having stigmatized a cultural detachment within state and
258 LCSA child support personnel and ministerial employees through their officers. A
259 responding state IV-D agency cannot refuse an initiating agency's request for
260 interstate services because of missing information or documents. **Federal**
261 **regulations at 45 CFR 303.7 govern intergovernmental IV-D case processing.**
262 They spell out the duties of the initiating agency, the interstate central registry,
263 and the responding agency. If the documentation received with a case is
264 incomplete and cannot be remedied by the central registry without help from the
265 initiating agency, the central registry must notify the initiating agency of the
266 missing information under **45 CFR 303.7(b)(2)(iii)**, and also forward the case to
267 the local office for any action that can be taken pending necessary action by the
268 initiating agency under **45 CFR 303.7(b)(3)**. The local responding agency also has
269 responsibility to notify the initiating agency of additions or corrections that are
270 needed to the forms or documentation, **under 45 CFR 303.7(d)(2)(ii).**

Remedy:

Injunctive and declaratory relief is sought. To order elimination of any remaining costs, penalties, fines or fees associated with "child support." To order arbitrary bail fees generated during the period of harm to be released by Bartlesville Municipal Court, to issue injunctive protections from arrest on current failure to pay warrants while pursuing liberty interests in Washington County Oklahoma in petitioning for dissolution of marriage from Amanda Parsons on grounds of adultery and bigamy and while pursuing restorative reunification services in that county with his children. Declaratory order for Oklahoma Department of Human Services to provide reunification services, ad hoc. As stated in claim served upon Washington County Clerk; Fifty Million Dollars as replacement of lost income, and with penalties associated with the prevention of opportunities and experiences for both professional development and to provide for the society and companionship of his children and for the actions and inactions so repugnant to democracy and the Constitutional Fundamentals violated and abridged herein together with the defamation done being remedied as well as allowing a financial foundation to restore familial interests damaged through this collection of actions and inactions which have caused such reprehensible harm to the liberty interests

289 of the Pro Se Litigant, Ryan Walter and such other relief as may be found just and
290 proper.

 02/26/2021
10/26/2021